

ORIGINAL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

POINT BLANK BODY ARMOR, INC. *

Plaintiff *

vs. *

ALLEN PRICE, et al *

Defendants *

* * * * *

VERDICTA. SALARY

1. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they are entitled to compensation for salary for the week of September 21, 2001?

a. Mr. Price

Yes
(Yes or No)

b. Mr. Krummel

Yes
(Yes or No)

c. Mr. Murray

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," as to each person do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next section. As to each person as to whom your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 2.

FILED
LODGED
ENTERED
RECEIVED

JUL 17 2003

AT BALTIMORE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
DEPUTY

BY

CIVIL ACTION NO. MJG-01-3256

2. What amount of salary, if any, have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they are entitled for the week of September 21, 2001?

a. Mr. Price \$ 2,884.61

b. Mr. Krummel \$ 2,500.00

c. Mr. Murray \$ 1,250.00

3. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Company did not withhold payment of their salary for the week of September 21, 2001 by virtue of a bona fide dispute?

a. Mr. Price Yes
(Yes or No)

b. Mr. Krummel Yes
(Yes or No)

c. Mr. Murray Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 4.

4. What additional amount, if any, up to three times the amount of any award in response to Question 2, do you award the following Individuals with regard to their salary for the week of September 21, 2001?

a. Mr. Price \$ 8,653.83

b. Mr. Krummel \$ 7,500.00

c. Mr. Murray \$ 3,750.00

B. STOCK

1. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they were entitled to receive unrestricted stock rather than restricted stock?

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 2.

2. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that if they had received unrestricted shares they would have sold them on January 3, 2002?

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 3.

3. What amount, if any, have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they would have netted had they sold their shares on January 3, 2002?

a. Mr. Price \$ 58,638.95

b. Mr. Krummel \$ 29,189.94

c. Mr Murray \$ 7,222.46

4. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Company did not provide them with unrestricted rather than restricted shares by virtue of a bona fide dispute?

a. Mr. Price

Yes
(Yes or No)

b. Mr. Krummel

Yes
(Yes or No)

c. Mr. Murray

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 5.

5. What additional amount, if any, up to three times the amount you awarded in response to Question 3, do you award the Individuals with regard to the receipt of restricted stock?

a. Mr. Price

J.W. O'Pry
\$ ~~50,630.95~~ 175,916.85

b. Mr. Krummel

J.W. O'Pry
\$ ~~29,184.94~~ 87,554.82

c. Mr. Murray

J.W. O'Pry
\$ ~~7,222.46~~ 21,667.38

C. WARRANTS

1. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that on September 28, 2001, when they left the employ of the Company, their rights to receive warrants for nine months had vested?

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 2.

2. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they were entitled to receive Warrants to purchase unrestricted stock rather than restricted stock?

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 3.

3. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that if they had received warrants for unrestricted shares they would have executed them and sold the stock received on January 3, 2002?

Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section and proceed to the next Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 4.

4. What amount, if any, have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that they would have netted had they executed their warrants and sold the stock received on January 3, 2002?

a. Mr. Price \$ 116,455.03
b. Mr. Krummel \$ 87,273.99
c. Mr. Murray \$ 38,638.95

5. Have the Individuals proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the Company did not provide them with warrants for restricted rather than unrestricted shares by virtue of a bona fide dispute?

a. Mr. Price Yes
(Yes or No)
b. Mr. Krummel Yes
(Yes or No)
c. Mr. Murray Yes
(Yes or No)

If your answer is "No," do not answer any further questions in this Section. If your answer is "Yes," proceed to question 6.

6. What additional amount, if any, up to three times the amount you awarded in response to Question 4, do you award the following Individuals with regard to the receipt of warrants?

a. Mr. Price \$ 0.00
b. Mr. Krummel \$ 0.00
c. Mr. Murray \$ 0.00

The foregoing constitutes the unanimous verdict of the jury.

Date: July 16, 2003

James W. Ogden
Foreperson